Dealing with complexity through â??actor-focusedâ?• Planning, Monitoring & Evaluation (PME)

Description

Tweet

From results-based management towards results-based learning
Jan Van Ongevalle (HIVA), Huib Huyse (HIVA), Cristien Temmink (PSO), Eugenia Boutylkova (PSO), Anneke Maarse (Double Loop)
November 2012. Available as pdf

This document is the final output of the PSO Thematic Learning Programme (TLP) on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (PME) of Complex Processes of Social Change, facilitated and funded by PSO, Netherlands and supported by HIVA (Belgium).

1. Introduction

This paper reports the results of a collaborative action-research process (2010-2012) in which 10 development organisations (nine Dutch and one Belgian), together with their Southern partners, explored if and how a variety of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (PME) approaches and methods helped them deal with processes of complex change. These approaches include Outcome Mapping (OM), Most Significant Change (MSC), Sensemaker, client-satisfaction instruments, personal-goal exercises, outcome studies, and scorecards.

The study has been supported by PSO, an association of Dutch development organisations that supports capacity-development processes. The Research Institute for Work and Society (HIVA) at the University of Leuven (KU Leuven) provided methodological support.

The collaborative-action research took place on two interconnected levels. At the first level, individual organisations engaged in their own action-research processes in order to address their organisation-specific PME challenges. At a collective level, we wanted to draw lessons from across the individual cases. The overall aim was to find out if and how the various PME approaches piloted in the cases had helped the organisations and their partners to deal with complex change processes. We tried to answer this question by exploring how the PME approaches assisted the pilot cases to deal with the following four implications of PME in complexity: 1) dealing with multiple relations and perspectives; 2) learn about the results of the programme; 3) strengthen adaptive capacity; and 4) satisfy different accountability needs. These four questions constitute the main analytic framework of the action research.

A PME approach in this paper refers to the PME methods, tools and concepts and the way they are implemented within a specific context of a programme or organisation. A PME approach also encompasses the underlying values, principles and agenda that come with its methods, tools and concepts. A PME system refers to the way that PME approaches and PME related activities are practically organised, interlinked and implemented within a specific context of a programme or organisation.

Part of the uniqueness of this paper stems from the fact that it is based on the â??real lifeâ?• experiences of the ten pilot cases, where the participants took charge of their own individual action-research processes with the aim of strengthening their PME practice. The results presented in this article are based on an analysis across the 10 cases. It is the result of close collaboration with representatives of the different cases through various rounds of revision. A group of external advisors also gave input in the cross case analysis. Extracts of the different cases are given throughout the results chapter to illustrate arguments made. More detailed information about each case can be found in the individual case reports, which are available at: https://partos.nl/content/planning-monitoring-and-evaluation -complex-processes-social-change

Category

1. Uncategorized

Tags

1. actor
2. complexity
3. social change

Date
09/11/2026
Date Created
14/12/2012
Author
admin